

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagatani et al. (US 5,764,845). Claim 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kida et al. (US 5,321,789) in view of Thomas et al. (US 6,978,409). Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nagatani et al. in view of Surati et al. (US 6,456,339) and Thomas et al. Claims have been amended and allowance of all pending claims is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to define the invention more clearly. In particular, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to show that the first and second lattice patterns are different. Basis for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figures 16 and 17 and on paragraphs [0046] and [0059]. Claim 1 has also been amended to remove the feature that the output ends are arranged in the first lattice pattern, and claim 12 has been amended to remove the feature that the input ends are arranged in the first lattice pattern.

Further, a clear definition of the term "lattice pattern" has been included in the description. That is, a lattice pattern is the pattern associated with the relative positioning of an element of one type with respect to other elements of the same type, wherein the elements include pixel devices, input ends and output ends. Basis for this amendment can be found, for example, by referring to paragraphs [0046], [0059], claims 3 and 4 and Figures 1 – 5.

It should now be clear to the Examiner that the lattice pattern is different to the end shapes of the light guide. That is, merely because an end of a light guide has a hexagonal shape does not mean that it is always going to be arranged in a hexagonal lattice pattern. Figure 16 clearly shows an arrangement with a square lattice pattern of pixel devices and Figure 17 clearly shows a hexagonal lattice pattern (with square pixel devices). This is also clear when comparing the features of claims 3 and 4, which refer to lattice patterns, and claims 5, 6 and 7, which refer to end shapes of the light guides.

The Examiner previously argued that claim 1 was anticipated by *Nagatani*. Claims 1 and 12 now include the feature that the first and second lattice patterns are different. The prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests this feature, nor indeed some of the other features of claims 1 and 12.

In *Nagatani*, devices are shown in Figures 15 and 26 that include a number of light guide devices 10 arranged in a matrix directly above a number of pin hole shaped openings 24. The pin-hole shaped openings receive light from a light source 40 within a reflection box 52.

The pinhole openings 24 are not light sensitive pixel devices. Indeed, the pinhole openings are not even light sensitive let alone pixel devices, but merely allow light to pass through.

In relation to claim 1, the pinhole openings are arranged in the same lattice pattern as the input ends of the light guide devices. That is, the relative positioning of the pinhole openings is the same as the relative positioning of the input ends. Indeed, the input ends of the light guide devices are placed directly over the pinhole openings in order to receive the light emitted from the opening. There is no teaching or suggestion that the input end of the light guide device should be arranged in a different lattice pattern to that of the pinhole opening, and if it were, the device shown in *Nagatani* would cease to function as light would not be transferred from the light box via the pinholes into the light guide devices.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kida et al. (US 5,321,789) in view of Thomas et al. (US 6,978,409). Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nagatani et al. in view of Surati et al. (US 6,456,339) and Thomas et al.

Further, the Examiner argued that claim 12 was obvious in view of *Kida* and *Thomas*. As noted above, claims 1 and 12 now include the feature that the first and second lattice

patterns are different. The prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests this feature, nor indeed some of the other features of claims 1 and 12.

In relation to claim 12, the output ends of the light guides in *Nagatani* are arranged in the same lattice pattern as the pinhole openings. That is, the relative positioning of the pinhole openings is the same as the relative positioning of the output ends. Although the output ends of the light guides in *Nagatani* may be of a different shape (hexagonal) to the pinholes (circular), this does not mean that the pinholes and output ends are arranged in a different lattice pattern. It can be seen from Figure 15 in *Nagatani* that both the output ends and pinholes are arranged in the same lattice pattern consisting of a 23 x 18 matrix, with alternate rows offset by 50%.

*Kida* does not teach or suggest the display screen as claimed in claim 1 or claim 12 in at least as much as *Kida* does not disclose an array of pixel devices and a light guide with input and output ends wherein the array of pixel devices are arranged in a first lattice pattern, and the input ends (claim 1) or output ends (claim 12) are arranged in a different lattice pattern. Indeed, *Kida* teaches a light guide tube 117 with a plurality of apertures 118 as shown in Figure 2. Pixels of a light valve 103 are matched with the apertures in arrangement and shape (col.6, lines 30-38).

Neither *Thomas* nor *Surati* teach or suggest a display screen with light guides, let alone the arrangement of different lattice patterns for the input ends of a light guide and array of pixel devices when compared to the output ends of the light guide.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 12 are novel and unobvious over the prior art of record. Further, claims 2 – 11 are also novel and inventive due to their dependencies.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on all these considerations and amendment, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is again urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,

ELLIOTT

By his attorneys,

UNISYS CORPORATION  
Unisys Way, MS/E8-114  
Blue Bell, PA 19424  
(215) 986-3325

Date: 15 August 2008

By /Richard J. Gregson/  
Richard J. Gregson  
Reg. No. 41,804